

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, and 12-15 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 9, and 13 are currently amended. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, and 12-15 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 9, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0052882 (hereinafter “Taylor”), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0077998 (hereinafter “Andrews”), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,820,082 (hereinafter “Cook”). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor, in view of Andrews, in further view of Cook and non-patent literature entitled “New Product News” by Mary Jo Nott (hereinafter “Nott”). Claims 6, 7, 10, 15, and 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor, in view of Andrews, in further view of Cook and U.S. Patent No. 6,014,664 (hereinafter “Fagin”).

**Objections to the Claims**

At the Examiner’s suggestion, Applicants have presented canceled claims 2, 4, 8, 11, and 16 by erasing the body of the claims.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, and 12-15 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Taylor, Andrews, Cook, Nott, and Fagin. Applicants respectfully submit that Taylor, Andrews, Cook, Nott, and Fagin, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, and 12-15. These differences, along with other difference, establish that the subject matter as a whole of claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, and 12-15 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

For example, amended claim 1 recites the feature of “forwarding, from a source computer system, information that configures a destination computer to display a first graphical user interface allowing a user of the destination computer system to define a data format for the sales leads stored in the data source and select at least one of a database option and a spreadsheet file option presented by the first graphical user interface for the data source, the data format indicative of potential sales leads including at least a first name, a last name, and an email address.” As recited, information is forwarded from the source computer system that configures the destination computer system to display a second graphical user interface allowing a user of the destination computer system to define a plurality of rules that operate on data formatted according to the data format to assess a quality of the potential sales leads, wherein each rule in the plurality of rules defines:

information indicative of at least one attribute of the data formatted according to the data format on which the rule operates,

information indicative of an expression that defines a type of test that will be applied to the at least one attribute, and

information configured to assess a quality of the at least one attribute of the data satisfied by the rule.

As recited in amended claim 1, information is forwarded from the source computer that configures the destination computer system to display a third graphical user interface allowing a user of the destination computer system to map data identifying a plurality of sales leads from the selected data source to the data format.

Applicants respectfully submit that Taylor, Andrews, Cook, Nott, and Fagin, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the manner in which sales leads stored in a database are evaluated as recited in amended claim 1 because Taylor, Andrews, Cook, Nott, and Fagin fail to allow the user to specify a plurality of rules that operate on data formatted according to the data format to assess a quality of the potential sales leads as recited in amended claim 1. As recited in claim 1, the plurality of rules are executed on the mapped data to produce a set of analyzed data that allows evaluation of potential sales leads according to an overall assessed quality of each potential sales lead in the mapped data. (Emphasis added).

In contrast, Taylor, Andrews, Cook, Nott, and Fagin fail to disclose evaluation of potential sales leads according to an overall assessed quality of each potential sales lead in the mapped data as recited in amended claim 1. Fagin, which suggest the weighting of combinational functions in rules, fails to disclose or suggest rules that include “information configured to assess a quality of the at least one attribute of the data satisfied by the rule” as recited in amended claim 1. Moreover, Fagin merely weights the individual parameters of the combination function, fails to suggest evaluation of potential sales leads according to an overall assessed quality of each potential sales lead in the mapped data as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Taylor, Andrews, Cook, Nott, and Fagin fail to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in amended claim 1. Applicants further respectfully submit that none of the cited references cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Taylor, Andrews, Cook, Nott, and Fagin, and thus, amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 9 and 13 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims that depend directly and/or indirectly from independent claims 1, 9, and 13, respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/  
Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
SFP:lls  
62084312 v1